

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 25, 2008. In the subject Office Action claims 1, 2 and 5-16 were pending in the application. Claims 12-16 were allowed. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,416,125 (Theve). Claims 5, 7 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

With this response, applicant has amended all of the pending claims to remove reference numerals. Independent claim 12 also has been amended to enhance readability. In addition, claims 5, 7 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim (original claim 1) and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that claims 12-16 remain allowed and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 5, 7 and 8.

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 9-11 were rejected as anticipated by Theve. With respect to claim 1 which is currently amended, the Office Action alleges that all the limitations of claim 1 are disclosed by Theve. Applicant respectfully disagrees since claim 1 recites features not taught or suggested by Theve. Claim 1 recites an inner tube, fabricated of a conductive material, surrounded by an outer tube, fabricated of a dielectric material, with the enlarged inner end portions of the contact members being reciprocally slidably mounted in opposite ends of the inner tube. Theve does not teach such features; see column 2, lines 30-36 which indicates that terminal 16 is fixed and stationary with respect to inner casing 12. Indeed, in column 3, lines 7-12, terminal contact 16 is referred to as "stationary terminal contact 16". It is clear that

Theve does not teach contact members being reciprocally slidably mounted in opposite ends of the inner tube.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to recite said pressure contacting end portions being defined as those parts of the contact members which project beyond the opposite ends of the sleeve when the enlarged inner end portions abut the restricted stop means. Theve does teach such features. In particular, Theve does not disclose pressure contacting end portions which project beyond the opposite ends of the sleeve.

No new matter has been added with this amendment as there is ample support provided in the specification and the drawings. See for example at least paragraphs [0020], [0023] and [0024] and Figs. 4 and 7.

For at least these reasons, Theve does not anticipate claim 1. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2, 6 and 9-11 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1. In addition, claims 2, 6 and 9-11 are distinct and recite features not taught or suggested by the cited references.

For at least all of foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of and objections to claims 1, 2, and 5-16. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

With the electronic filing of this response, applicant has charged five hundred sixty dollars (\$540.00) for the payment of two independent claims in excess of three (\$420) and for a one-month extension of time fee (\$120). It is believed that no other fees are due with this reply. However, if additional fees should be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1039 for any such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael D. Zaronias/

Michael D. Zaronias
Registration No. 54,564

Date: June 24, 2008